



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/791,273

03/03/2004

Takeshi Hirose

1046.1313

8945

21171

7590

07/25/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

SUITE 700

1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

AU, SCOTT D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2612

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/791,273

Applicant(s)

HIROSE ET AL.

Examiner

Scott Au

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ✓
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) ✓
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The application of Hirose et al. for a "Power source control device for electronic device" filed March 3, 2004 has been examined.

Claims 1-23 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Imaizumi et al. (US# 4,860,002).

Referring to claim 1, Imaizumi et al. disclose a power source control device for an electronic device, comprising:

- a storage unit (i.e. NVM) storing condition information about conditions for supplying electric power to an electronic device;
- a receiving unit receiving (300) (i.e. receiver), via a communication path from a power source remote control device of said electronic device, condition judging information for judging whether a power supply command to said electronic device and the conditions are met or not;

Art Unit: 2612

a judging unit (100) (i.e. microcomputer) judging whether the conditions are met or not by use of the condition judging information received by said receiving unit and the condition information stored on the storage unit; and
a supply unit controlling (i.e. solenoid), in a case where said judging unit judges that the conditions are met, a power source of said electronic device so that said electronic device is supplied with the electric power (col. 8 lines 48-67; see Figure 1).

Referring to claim 2, Imaizumi et al. teach the power source control device for an electronic device according to claim 1, further comprising: a notifying unit (300) (i.e. receiver) notifying, in a case where said receiving unit receives a stop command (i.e. unrecognized key code) of a supply of the electric power to said electronic device from said power source remote control device (200) (i.e. transmitter), said power source remote control device of the condition judging information associated with the condition information stored on said storage unit (i.e. memory, NVM); a check-and-judge unit (100) (i.e. microcomputer) judging, in a case where said receiving unit receives from said power source remote control device the condition judging information which said notifying unit has notified of, whether the conditions are met or not by use of the condition judging information and the condition information stored on said storage unit; and a stopping unit controlling, in a case where said check-and-judge unit judges that the conditions are met, the power source of said electronic device so as to stop the supply of the electric power to said electronic device (col. 8 lines 48-67; see Figure 1).

Referring to claim 3, Imaizumi et al. teach the power source control device for an electronic device according to claim 1, wherein said storage unit stores collation source information as the condition information, said receiving unit receives collation object information as the condition judging information from said power source remote control device, and said judging unit, in a case where the collation source information is coincident with the collation object information, judges that the conditions are met (col. 8 lines 48-67; see Figure 1).

Referring to claim 4, Imaizumi et al. teach the power source control device for an electronic device according to claim 3, wherein the collation source information contains identifying information of said electronic device (col. 8 lines 48-67; see Figure 1).

Referring to claim 5, Imaizumi et al. teach the power source control device for an electronic device according to claim 4, wherein the identifying information of said electronic device contains an end time of said electronic device (col. 2 lines 28-41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-14, 18, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaizumi et al. (US# 4,860,002) in view of Umeda et al. (US# 5,596,234).

Referring to claim 10, Imaizumi et al. disclose an electronic device, to the extent as claimed with respect to claim 1 above, Imaizumi et al. as on silent on teaching the system of the electronic device further a power source remote control device including: a condition judging information storage unit storing the condition judging information; an input unit; and a transmitting unit transmitting, in a case where a power supply command to said electronic device is inputted from said input unit, the power supply command and the condition judging information stored on said condition judging information storage unit to said power source control device via the communication path.

In the same field of endeavor of operation of electronic system, Umeda et al. teach a power source remote control device (30) (i.e. transmitter) including: a condition judging information storage unit (42) (i.e. modulating circuit) storing the condition

Art Unit: 2612

judging information; an input unit; and a transmitting unit (40) (i.e. oscillating circuit for oscillating the signal and transmitting the signal to the antenna 32 for transmission) transmitting, in a case where a power supply command to said electronic device is inputted from said input unit (38) (switch), the power supply command and the condition judging information stored on said condition judging information storage unit to said power source control device via the communication path (col. 4 lines 48-63).

One ordinary skill in the art understands that the remote control device of Umeda et al. is desirable in the system of Imaizumi et al. because Imaizumi et al. teach the remote transmitter (200) for transmitting signal to the receiver (300) to operate the vehicle (col. 8 lines 48-67) and Umeda et al. teach the transmitter (30) further including a modulating circuit (42) storing the condition judging information; a switch (38) as an input; and an oscillating circuit (40) for oscillating the signal and transmitting the signal through the antenna (32) (col. 4 lines 48-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the transmitter (30) of Umeda et al. in the transmitter (200) of system of Imaizumi et al. with the motivation for doing so would allow the code to be modulated and transmitted to the receiver.

Referring to claim 11, Imaizumi et al. in view of Umeda et al. disclose system of claim 10, Imaizumi et al. disclose wherein said power source control device further includes: a notifying unit (200) (i.e. transmitter) notifying, in a case where said receiving unit receives a stop command of a supply of the electric power to said electronic device

Art Unit: 2612

from said power source remote control device, said power source remote control device of the condition judging information associated with the condition information stored on said condition information storage unit; a check-and-judge unit judging, in a case where said receiving unit received from said power source remote control device the condition judging information which said notifying unit has notified of, whether the conditions are met or not by use of the condition judging information and the condition information stored on said storage unit; and a stopping unit stopping, in a case where said check-and-judge unit judges that the conditions are met, the supply of the electric power to said electronic device, and wherein said power source remote control device, in the case of receiving the condition judging information from said notifying information, stores said condition judging information storage unit with the condition judging information, and transmits the condition judging information to said power source control device for processing by said check-and-judge unit (col. 8 lines 48-67; see Figure 1).

Referring to claim 12, Imaizumi et al. in view of Umeda et al. disclose system of claim 11, Imaizumi et al. disclose wherein said storage unit stores collation source information as the condition information, said receiving unit receives collation object information as the condition judging information from said power source remote control device, and said judging unit, in a case where the collation source information is coincident with the collation object information, judges that the conditions are met (col. 8 lines 48-67; see Figure 1).

Referring to claim 13, Imaizumi et al. in view of Umeda et al. disclose system of claim 12, Imaizumi et al. disclose wherein the collation source information contains identifying information of said electronic device (col. 8 lines 48-67; see Figure 1)

Referring to claim 14, Imaizumi et al. in view of Umeda et al. disclose system of claim 13, Imaizumi et al. disclose wherein the identifying information of said electronic device contains an end time of said electronic device (col. 2 lines 28-41).

Referring to claim 18, Imaizumi et al. in view of Umeda et al. disclose system of claim 12, Imaizumi et al. disclose wherein the collation source information contains electronic device identifying information generated by said electronic device or by said power source control device and given as the collation object information to said power source remote control device, and contains user authenticating information received from said power source remote control device and used also as the collation object information (col. 8 lines 48-67; see Figure 1).

Referring to claim 20, Imaizumi et al. in view of Umeda et al. disclose system of claim 10, Umeda et al. disclose wherein said power source remote control device has a portable box body provided with said condition judging information storage unit, said input unit and said transmitting unit, and said transmitting unit transmits the power

supply command and the condition judging information to said power source control device in a non-contact communication (col. 4 lines 48-63).

Referring to claims 21,22, and 23, Imaizumi et al. in view of Umeda et al. disclose a system and method in claims 1 and 10, claims 21,22, and 23 equivalent to that the combine of claims 1 and 10 addressed above, incorporated herein. Therefore, claims 21,22, and 23 are **rejected for the same reasons given** with respect to claims 1 and 10 combined.

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaizumi et al. (US# 4,860,002) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Leck et al. (US# 6,420,971).

Referring to claim 6-7, Imaizumi et al. disclose the control device of claim 6. However, Imaizumi et al. did not explicitly disclose wherein the collation source information contains authenticating information of a user of said electronic device and the authenticating information of the user contains a password designated by the user.

In the same field of endeavor of electronic system, Leck et al. teach wherein the collation source information contains authenticating information of a user of said electronic device and the authenticating information of the user contains a password designated by the user (col. 15 lines 52-64).

One ordinary skill in the art understands that a user password to authenticate a locking device of Leck et al. is desirable in the locking system of Imaizumi et al. because Imaizumi et al. teach the transmitter (200) transmitting a signal to the receiver (300) to unlock a vehicle door (col. 8 lines 48-67; see Figure 1) and Leck et al. teach a password is inputted into a transmitter (30) in order to transmit a valid signal to operate the locking device (2) (col. 15 lines 52-67; see Figure 2).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaizumi et al. (US# 4,860,002) in view of Leck et al. (US# 6,420,971) as applied to claim 6, and further in view of Wuidart (US# 6,164,403).

Referring to claim 8, Imaizumi et al. in view of Leck et al. disclose the control device of claim 6. However, Imaizumi et al in view of Leck et al. did not explicitly disclose wherein the authenticating information of the user contains biometrics information of the user.

In the same field of endeavor of vehicle security system, Wuidart teaches the authenticating information of the user contains biometrics information of the user (col. 3 lines 48-67).

One ordinary skill in the art understands that the authenticating information of the user contains biometrics information of the user of Wuidart is desirable in the remote device (200) of Imaizumi et al. in view of Leck et al. because Imaizumi et al. disclose the remote transmitter (200) transmits signal to the receiver (300) of the vehicle (i.e.

see Figure 1), Leck et al. teach a password is inputted into a transmitter (30) in order to transmit a valid signal to operate the locking device (2) (col. 15 lines 52-67; see Figure 2) and Wuidart discloses the remote transmitter (11) the information is authenticated before the transmitting to the vehicle device 102 in order to secure the operation of the vehicle (col. 3 lines 48-67) and also using a biometric input as an alternative of using password to authenticate a locking device.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaizumi et al. (US# 4,860,002) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Wuidart (US# 6,164,403).

Referring to claim 9, Imaizumi et al. disclose the control device of claim 3. Imaizumi et al. disclose the power source control device for an the collation source information contains electronic device identifying information generated by said electronic device or by said power source control device and of which said power source remote control device is notified as the collation object information (col. 8 lines 48-67; see Figure 1). However, Imaizumi et al. did not explicitly disclose the control device contains user authenticating information received from said power source remote control device and used also as the collation object information.

In the same field of endeavor of vehicle security system, Wuidart teaches the control device contains user authenticating information received from said power source remote control device and used also as the collation object information.

(col. 3 lines 48-67).

One ordinary skill in the art understands that control device contains user authenticating information received from said power source remote control device and used also as the collation object information of Wuidart is desirable in the remote device (200) of Imaizumi et al. because Imaizumi et al. disclose the remote transmitter (200) transmits signal to the receiver (300) of the vehicle (i.e. see Figure 1) and Wuidart discloses the remote transmitter (11) the information is authenticated before the transmitting to the vehicle device 102 in order to secure the operation of the vehicle (col. 3 lines 48-67).

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaizumi et al. (US# 4,860,002) in view of Umeda et al. (US# 5,596,234) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Leck et al. (US# 6,420,971) and Wuidart (US# 6,164,403).

Referring to claims 15-17, Imaizumi et al. in view of Umeda et al. and further in view of Leck et al. and Wuidart disclose a security system in claims 6-8, claims 15-17 are equivalent to that of claims 6-8 addressed above, incorporated herein. Therefore, claims 15-17 are **rejected for same reasons given with respected** to claims 6-8.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Au whose telephone number is (571) 272-3063. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30AM – 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Hofsass can be reached at (571) 272-2981. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)-272-1817.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-3050.

Scott Au


7/12/06


JEFFERY HOFSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600